

IN THE SPECIFICATION:

Page 31, line 15: replace "eluent" by --eluant--.

REMARKS

Entry of the typographical error on page 31 of the specification is respectfully requested.

Further, claims 1, 8, - 10 and 11 have been amended to by replacing the expression "residue" objected/by the Examiner by the more precise term --radical--. Consequently, the objection to these claims as failing to comply with the requirements of 35 USC 112 has been obviated.

Now with respect to the restriction requirement, this is respectfully traversed for the reasons indicated in the Response filed in the Patent and Trademark Office on September 12, 1979.

Referring now to paragraph 6 of the Action, reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1 and 11 as failing to comply with the requirements of 35 USC 112. The terms specifically objected to include "an aryl group", "an aroyl group", "aralkyl ester residue", "a heterocyclic residue". The Examiner's objections to the aforesaid terms is clearly without basis and his attention is respectfully directed to Ex parte Scherberich and Pfeifer 201 USPQ 397 where the Board held, in considering terms such as "aryl", "aralkyl" and "alkaryl":

"..we are of the opinion that those in the art readily appreciate the total scope of this subject matter being defined..."

The Board then continued:

the
"...it is believed apparent that/claims use of the three terms 'aryl', 'aralkyl', and 'alkaryl' clearly indicates the intended scope of the substituent groups. As to the terms 'heterocyclic', it is seen as having an art recognized meaning and appellants have place no additional limitation on same. In considering all facets of the claimed subject matter, it is our view that those working in this art would have no difficulty in ascertaining the scope of the compounds that may be employed as reactants in the claimed process..."